

Amendments to the Drawings:

The attached sheet of drawings includes changes to FIG. 2. This sheet replaces the original sheet containing the illustrations disclosed in FIG. 2.

Attachment: Replacement Sheet

REMARKS

Claims 1-9 are pending in the present application. Claims 4, 6 and 9 were amended in this response to address the Examiner's objections. No new matter has been introduced. Favorable reconsideration is respectfully requested.

The drawings were objected to for containing the reference "Nutzdaten" in FIG.2. In light of the enclosed amended drawing, Applicants respectfully submit that the objection has been overcome. Accordingly, withdrawal of the object is earnestly requested.

Claims 4, 6 and 9 were objected to for inconsistent language in relation to other claims. In light of the above amendments, Applicants respectfully submit that the objection has been overcome. Accordingly, withdrawal of the object is earnestly requested.

Claims 2-5, 9 and 9 were objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Claims 1, 6 and 7 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over *Donovan et al.* (U.S. Patent No. 6,453,034) in view of *Berg et al.* (US Patent 6,680,952). For the following reasons, Applicants respectfully submit that the claims of the present application are patentable over the art of record and respectfully request that the rejections be withdrawn.

Specifically, the cited art, alone or in combination, does not disclose "separating time-slot-oriented signaling and user information allocated to a connection at a transmitter end," "transmitting the signaling information transparently via the first link," as well as the other related features recited in claim 1 and similarly recited in claim 7. The present application is directed generally to an arrangement for transmitting data between two communication devices such as PBX. The two transmitting endpoints are typically fixed and well defined. The claims recite a system and method for transmitting data between *two communication devices* over a network in light of a fixed line (see also page 1 lines 24-26 of the specification). A fixed line is also referred to as a trunk line. A trunk as a fixed connection of two communication devices or PBXs is completely different from a communications link as a resulting route of a calling endpoint to a called arbitrary endpoint.

Donovan does not teach an arrangement for transmitting data between two communication devices, as required in the present claims. Instead, *Donovan* teaches an

egress gateway 61 coupled to a network 47 via a routing decision through the network. Similarly, *Berg* teaches a media gateway controller handling the call processing from a variety of sources and not to an arrangement for transmitting data between two communication devices.

In contrast to the present claims, *Berg* teaches a media gateway controller that incorporates a call control unit (Fig 3, item s 322, 326) without having the entire functionality of a PBX. There is no ingress and no unit to handle payload/voice streams. The task of this controller is to process the signaling data received from the originating gateway and instruct the terminating gateway at the other end to establish a bearer channel for transmitting the payload (col. 6, lines 36-50) (referenced in the present claims as “user information”). Unlike a PBX, this controller merely handles signaling information to find an appropriate unit as an endpoint and instructs this endpoint (the terminating gateway 150) to establish the payload connection. The controller acts as an endpoint for both the originating and the terminating gateway, and respectively terminates the communication by answering a request message by a response message or an indication message by a confirm message (col. 11, lines 45-52).

Accordingly, *Berg* does not teach a method for transmitting data between two communication devices but a method for communicating between a PBX and another node, namely the media gateway controller. Furthermore, *Berg* teaches that the signaling data between the originating gateway 110 and the media gateway controller 120 differ from the signaling data between the media gateway controller 120 and the terminating gateway 150 (col. 11, lines 45-52). The media gateway handles the routing of the bearer channel by processing the signaling data.

In contrast, the present claims use a fixed connection between two end-points. As a result, there is no need to inspect the signaling data by an intermediary unit, and the signaling information is transmitted “transparently” as recited in the claims. Neither *Donovan* nor *Berg* disclose at least this feature.

In light of the above, Applicants respectfully submit that independent claims 1 and 7 of the present application, as well as claims 2-6 and 8-9 which respectfully depend therefrom, are both novel and non-obvious over the art of record. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that a timely Notice of Allowance be issued in this case. If any additional fees are due in

connection with this application as a whole, the Examiner is authorized to deduct such fees from deposit account no. 02-1818. If such a deduction is made, please indicate the attorney docket no. (0112740-235) on the account statement.

Respectfully submitted,

BELL, BOYD & LLOYD LLC

BY 

Peter Zura
Reg. No. 48,196
P.O. Box 1135
Chicago, Illinois 60690-1135
Phone: (312) 807-4208

Dated: March 28, 2005